

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 remain pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 8, and 13-17 have been allowed. Claims 3-7, 9-12, and 18 have been rejected on the basis of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claim 12 has been objected to on the basis of informalities. Based on the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

Interview on July 20, 2006

The Examiner is gratefully thanked for conducting an interview with the undersigned attorney on July 20, 2006. The rejections of claims 3-7, 9-12, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 were discussed at the interview.

Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 3-7, 9-12, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as failing to comply with the enablement requirement and for being indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration of the rejection.

Regarding claim 3, the Office Action at page 7 states the following:

- i. **Claim 3** appears to describe modeling a digital circuit output as an analog circuit output when the digital circuit output is a high impedance output. This subject matter is described in the claim, however this subject matter does not appear to be described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The Office Action at page 9 states the following regarding claim 3:

- i. Regarding claim 3, in the second limitation, the claim describes modeling said output (from a digital circuit) as an analog output signal from an analog circuit when the output is in a high impedance state. The output cannot both be in a high impedance state and in an analog signal state. It is not possible to determine the metes and bounds of the claim. Correction or amendment is required.

Claim 3 recites the following element:

modeling said output as a digital output signal from said digital circuit to said node when said output is not in said high impedance state, and as an analog output signal from said analog circuit to said node when said output is in said high impedance state; and

It appears that the Office Action objects to the portion of the claim element which recites that the output is modeled as an analog output signal from the analog circuit when the output is in a high impedance state.

Applicants respectfully note that at least the embodiment described at page 12, line 10 through page 13 line 9 of the Specification serve to satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 for claim 3. That section of the Specification discusses an example circuit 200 (shown in Fig. 2) having a digital logic gate 201 with an output at node 202. The fanout of 202 includes analog circuit block 203 and a logic gate 204. As noted at page 13 lines 1-9, when node 202 presents a Z value, the analog block 203 determines the voltage or signal present at node 202. The other fanouts of net 202, such as logic gate 204 will receive the voltage determined by analog block 203 rather than the Z value presented by

gate 201. This illustrative example clearly shows that the output can be modeled as an analog output signal from the analog circuit to the node when in the high impedance state.

For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that claim 3 satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. For at least this same reason, it is respectfully submitted that claims 4-7, 9-12, and 18 likewise satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Objection to Claim 12

Claim 12 has been objected to for informalities relating to the phrase "said plurality of digital circuits." Claim 12 has been amended to correct the reference to be consistent to a previous limitation. As such, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the claim objection.

Allowed Claims

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the allowance of claims 1, 2, 8, and 13-17.

Drawings

The Office Action noted that new corrected drawings are required in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d). In particular, the Office Action noted that the reference numbers are drawn by hand. Submitted herewith are formal drawings which correct the deficiencies noted by the Office Action.

Specification

The Office Action objects to the Abstract on the basis that the Abstract exceeds 150 words in length (MPEP § 608.01(b)). Applicants respectfully submit that the Abstract contains only 130 words and therefore complies with the requirements of MPEP § 608.01(b).

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, it is believed that, with entry of this amendment, all claims are now allowable and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding this amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at (650) 849-4870.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Bingham McCutchen's Deposit Account No. **50-2518**, referencing billing number **7010652001**. The Commissioner is authorized to credit any overpayment or to charge any underpayment to Bingham McCutchen's Deposit Account No. **50-2518**, referencing billing number **7010652001**.

Respectfully submitted,

Bingham McCutchen LLP

By: 

Peter C. Mei
Reg. No. 39,768

Dated: July 21, 2006

Bingham McCutchen LLP
Three Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, California 94111
Telephone: (650) 849-4870
Telefax: (650) 849-4800